

**CORRECTED**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**ASU Scottsdale Center  
Ad Hoc Citizens Advisory Working Group Meeting  
January 6, 2005, 5 PM  
Human Resources, Pinnacle Conference Room  
7575 E. Main St., Scottsdale, AZ**

**Present:** Margaret Dunn, George Adams, Susan Coykendall, A. Thomas Jelinek, Kurt Merschman, Jim Cramer, Rita Saunders-Hawrenek, Marilyn Armstrong

**Absent:** Andrea Michaels

**Staff:** Ed Gawf, Kroy Ekblaw, Randy Grant, Lisa Collins, Teresa Huish, Dave Roderique, Katherine Hutton Raby, Mary O'Conner, Dave Meinhart, Dawn Coomer, Brian Hancock, Yvonne Steill

**Welcome from Ed**

**Member update:** Steve Steinberg withdrew from the team. His firm is one of the final four that ASU is considering to hire for this project and though he is not directly related to the project, he did not want there to be a perceived conflict of interest.

**General Comments**

Rita passed out her 'homework' to members of the Ad hoc group. Over the holiday, she interviewed 10 business people from around the country and asked them what they would be looking for in a development such as this.

Idea Cards – give to Lisa or Ed during meeting.

**Follow up on working group questions regarding Economic Development**

Facilitors: Dave Roderique & Katherine Hutton-Raby from Economic Development

- Discussed concerns of retail picture for this development.
- Passed out maps of existing retail. Described types of existing retail within 3 and 6-mile radius of the project.
- Discussed how different retailers decide how close to build additional locations? Variety of factors – demographics; lease agreements; transportation systems; natural barriers. No magic formula – but it is clear that some of the retail that Katherine described will not consider going into this project due to the proximity of their other locations.
- Until this area changes dramatically in population density, employment density, etc. we will not see another grocery store in this area.

- Passed out materials describing AME Arts, Media & Entertainment – a cross-disciplinary school that attracts people from all over the world. The only other location is located at MIT. This would be housed in the first bldg that will be built on the site (95% certainty).

**Connections & integration to adjacent commercial and residential area including: pedestrian, vehicular, transit opportunities and circulation opportunities**

Facilitator: Mary O’Conner

**Summary of survey responses**

**Access –**

- Residents need to access the site by all modes of transportation
- Priority – biking, walking, driving, public transportation (trolley, bus, light-rail)
- People want to access a variety of services at this site.
- Pharmacy service is crucial.
- Provision for delivery trucks.
- Non-residents would access by driving or public transportation.
- Neighborhood gateway treatments help to provide a sense of place & protect the neighborhood; may discourage overflow parking.
- Quiet spaces (shaded) where people can rest and are integrated with services, including restrooms. Area should include public art, gardens, etc.
- Consider consolidating curb cuts along Scottsdale Rd. to reduce or eliminate pedestrian conflicts.
- Consider using elements from the GLUE study

**Street Corridors**

- What’s more important? Roadway balance? Or maintaining traffic flow?
- Balanced approach would be best
- Pedestrian friendliness needs to increase; many seniors in the area, must be accessible to them
- Streetscape project on Scottsdale Rd. There are no plans to make intersection improvements to enhance traffic flow.
- Make intersections ADA friendly; consider an area in the middle of the road where pedestrians would feel safe for those who need additional time to cross.
- We don’t want to narrow Scottsdale Rd or McDowell Rd – these are major thoroughfares and we need to keep traffic moving in this area.
- Streets/streetscape should respond to the land use in the area.
- Access to 101 & 202 is important
- Event traffic – impacts to roadway
- Not a matter of widening or narrowing, but reconfigure it to make it look better.
- Transit links between ASU main & ASU Scottsdale
- Transit hub located on the site
- ASU circulator – free & frequent trolley that will run through the area to major destinations in the area. Should there be a priority destination for this mode of transportation? Depends upon site characteristics. Connection between this site & the

McDowell Village Senior Center? Connection to downtown? Maybe a 3-mile radius? Connect to University & Rural LRT.

- Short term visitors from other countries – would require public transportation, etc.
- High capacity transit identified for Scottsdale Rd. Bus rapid transit would require a dedicated lane.
- Mode that operates best in mixed traffic is the streetcar.
- Questions to think about
  - What type of high capacity transit is appropriate for this area?
  - Should it extend north of ASU/Scottsdale?
  - What type of connection is preferred for transportation between main campus & ASU-Scottsdale?
  - What about east/west movement?

### **Special features at intersections**

- Markers are nice, but not necessarily a priority.
- Public restrooms need to be provided

### **Parking**

- No paid parking in Scottsdale.
- Depending upon campus uses, have to think about the fact that ASU students may use this as free parking and take the shuttle to the main campus.
- Provide showers for employees/etc to encourage them to bike/walk to work.
- Not able to make concrete decisions without more information about what is happening on the site.
- Neighborhood parking is a ‘gateway’ issue. Need to consider the needs of the residents, especially if we have paid parking. Explore neighborhood permit parking as an option?
- ASU center employees will have their own place to park.
- Consider cost of parking:
  - \$2,500- surface
  - \$10,000 – structure above grade
  - \$20,000 – structure below grade
- Transportation Demand Management – discussion for another meeting

### **Parameters of Development & Land Use Relationships between the site & adjacent parcels**

Facilitators: Kroy Ekblaw, Teresa Huish

Prioritization is a key element to this project. Hundreds of ideas, but which ones do we want to make certain are included? Create a Top 5 or Top 10 list.

Zoning Map presented and discussed– Earll to southern boundary / city limits to 101

These zoning districts came about in the 1950’s, when these areas were developed. Several large residential areas with a school (or former school) was located in the middle. Buffers on the edges typically retail/commercial or multi-family zoning. Mix of commercial zoning districts along major thoroughfares of Scottsdale Road & McDowell.

Using an overlay zoning district for the site will allow a mixed-use type of development. Planned Community District will allow us to identify all the different uses we're considering and have the opportunity to stack uses.

Consider allowing from 36 to 60 ft building height.

Do we want large open space requirements?

Guiding principals of the project and what are we looking for?

- Mixed-use
  - Housing, different types of housing (lofts, condos, apts)
  - Retail, smaller (mom & pop) and how it mixes with larger retailers
  - Retail that serves existing neighborhoods and new neighborhoods
  - Industrial/Research
  - Family friendly (if there is going to be housing, etc)
- Connectivity
  - Neighborhoods
  - Family friendly
  - Transportation to services
  - 3-mile radius
  - not necessarily automobile related
- Sense of Place & Community gathering
  - A place to meet neighbors & friends (since Los Arcos left, that's gone now). Place to reconnect.
  - Intergenerational. Authentic community.
  - Meets social & economic needs
  - Hip, cool, upbeat place that draws people to the area
  - Marketing the area is important (live/work/play) (proximity to amenities)
  - Work to revitalize older neighborhoods (celebrate, emphasize charm of these areas)
  - What is unique to Scottsdale
  - Comfort & safety in the area
- Hometown feel Nostalgia
  - Sense of pride, quality, history

See Six guiding principals of CityShape 2020

Quality of schools needs to be an ongoing emphasis. Families are concerned about the elimination of programs, etc. Bond election will help, but this should continue to be an emphasis.

### **Public Comment**

Following of agenda as it relates to public comment.

Minutes available the following day.

Would like to see lofts discouraged in this area.

Concern that there wasn't a quorum at tonight's meeting.

### **Wrap-Up**

- Will email final schedule for Design Charrettes
- Tues, Jan 11, noon – kick off meeting with UDA, City Staff @ the Design Studio
- Wed, Jan 12, 6pm – dinner meeting (key meeting of the 3) Working session with UDA
- Thurs, Jan 13, 5:30pm – public meeting hosted by the Ad-hoc advisory group
- Friday, Jan 14, morning – debriefing

Steve Steinberg letter – It was decided that Ed will not approach Council and ask them to appoint a new member. If Steve's firm is not selected, then he will come back to the group (should occur within a month).

A spokesperson/chairperson for the group – Meet for a few minutes after one of the Charrette groups and decide on that issue.

Thomas would like to disseminate information to his congregation. Postcards will be ready for pickup tomorrow. Revise to request an RSVP for Thursday night.